

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LUFKIN DIVISION

RICHARD JAMES JOHNSON	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:17-CV-113
DIRECTOR, TDJC-CID	§	

MEMORANDUM ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS AND
ADOPTING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner, Richard James Johnson, a prisoner confined at the J.V. Allred Unit of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The court referred this matter to the Honorable Keith Giblin, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. The Magistrate Judge recommends the petition be dismissed without prejudice as successive.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge filed pursuant to such order, along with the record, and pleadings. Petitioner filed objections to the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge. This requires a *de novo* review of the objections in relation to the pleadings and applicable law. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). After careful consideration, the court finds petitioner’s objections lacking in merit.

Petitioner concedes he has already sought habeas relief concerning this conviction and sentence. Section 2244(b)(3)(A) constitutes a bar to the this court’s jurisdiction to consider a successive habeas petition unless a three-judge panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has first granted the petitioner permission to file such a petition. *United States v. Key* 205 F.3d 773, 774 (5th Cir. 2000) (per curiam); *see also Crone v. Cockrell*, 324 F.3d 833, 836 (5th Cir. 2003) (section 2254 petitioner). The petition should be dismissed without prejudice to the right of petitioner to seek permission from the Fifth Circuit to file a successive petition.

ORDER

Accordingly, the objections of petitioner are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Magistrate Judge are correct, and the report of the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered in this case in accordance with the Magistrate Judge's recommendations.

In addition, the court is of the opinion petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying post-conviction collateral relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 849 (2000).

In this case, petitioner has not shown that the issues of concern are subject to debate among jurists of reason or worthy of encouragement to proceed further. As a result, a certificate of appealability shall not issue in this matter.

So Ordered and Signed

Jan 11, 2018



Ron Clark, United States District Judge